

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/343,736	SPEAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher Verdier	3745	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher Verdier. (3) _____.

(2) David Quinlan, Attorney of Record. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 02 April 2001.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: *Proposed FAX copy of amendments to claims and 1.132 affidavit by Mr. Weingold*.

Claim(s) discussed: 4-41.

Identification of prior art discussed: *Hull, Cox, and Szydlowski*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants proposed amendments to the claims to more specifically set forth the configuration of the tip region translation (forward and rearward), which the examiner agreed overcame the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. With regard to the affidavit by Mr. Weingold, it was explained by Applicants' representative as set forth in the affidavit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not conclude that Cox or Hull discloses or suggests the particular blade sweep of the claimed invention because these references are silent as to sweep angle and flow conditions. The examiner indicated that the affidavit would be carefully weighed against the inferences one of ordinary skill in the art would draw from Hull and Cox. The examiner agreed with Applicants that figure 10D of Cox more accurately shows the blade leading edge profile of Cox than figure 10B. Concerning claim 30, it was agreed upon that the proposed amendment to claim 30 defines over Szydlowski.

60000-000000000000